

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 05685 261614Z

43

ACTION SS-30

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00 /031 W

----- 087870

O R 261535Z OCT 73

FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2155

INFO DOD

S E C R E T SALT TWO GENEVA 5685

EXDIS/SALT

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

E.O. 11652 XGDSI

TAGS: PARM

SUBJ: COMMENTS ON OCTOBER 26 MEETING (SALT TWO-324)

1. AT TODAY'S MEETING SEMENOV DEFENDED ARTICLE V OF USSR DRAFT PROPOSAL AND ANSWERED OUR QUESTION ON STRATEGIC BOMBERS BY STATING THAT IT INCLUDED B-52'S ON US SIDE AND MYASISHCHEVS AND TU-95'S ON SOVIET SIDE. (SHCHUKIN INDICATED IN PRIVATE CONVERSATION WITH NITZE THAT CORRESPONDENCE OF THEIR TERM "STRATEGIC BOMBER" WITH U.S. TERM "HEAVY BOMBERS" WAS LINKED TO THEIR PROPOSAL FOR WITHDRAWAL OF FBS AIRCRAFT.) THROUGHOUT HIS PRESENTATION SEMENOV CAREFULLY LINKED LIMITATIONS ON NUMBERS OF BOMBERS TO BOMBER ARMAMENTS, NOTING THEIR PROPOSAL FOR NO AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILES WITH NUCLEAR WEAPONS ON BOMBERS. BELETSKY ANSWERED QUESTION ON MEANING OF "IN RESERVE" BY STATING THAT "IN RESERVE" IS DISTINGUISHED FROM "MOTHBALLED" BY THE SHORTER TIME THAT IT WOULD TAKE TO PLACE "IN RESERVE" PLANES IN OPERATION. IN RESPONSE TO ROWNY'S QUESTION, HE WOULD NOT FURTHER DEFINE TIME ELEMENTS THAT THEY HAD IN MIND. WHEN NITZE ASKED QUESTION AS TO WHETHER THEIR DEFINITION WOULD ALSO APPLY TO SOVIET HEAVY BOMBER TYPES CONFIGURED AS TANKERS AND RECONNAISSANCE AIRCRAFT, SEMENOV QUICKLY JUMPED IN TO STOP BELETSKY FROM ANSWERING AND MADE STATEMENT THAT THIS HAD ALREADY BEEN DISCUSSED AT PREVIOUS SALT SESSIONS, BUT WE COULD "IN THE THE FUTURE GO DEEPER INTO THE SUBJECT TAKING

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 05685 261614Z

THOSE PRIOR DISCUSSIONS INTO ACCOUNT."

2. IN OUR FOLLOWING PRIVATE DISCUSSION SEMENOV FIRST  
INFERENTIALLY INQUIRED AS TO WHETHER I WAS GOING TO MAKE  
PROPOSAL FOR RECESS. WHEN I DID NOT RISE TO THE BAIT, HE  
DID NOT PURSUE SUBJECT.

3. HE THEN MADE STATEMENT FROM WRITTEN NOTES PROFESSING  
PUZZLEMENT AS TO OUR NEGATIVE REACTION TO SOVIET DRAFT  
AND OUR CHARACTERIZATION OF IT AS ONE-SIDED, AS WELL AS  
EXPRESSING CONCERN THAT NEGOTIATIONS APPEARED TO BE AT  
STANDSTILL. IN RESPONSE, I SAID THAT HE SHOULD NOT BE  
SURPRISED AS THEIR DRAFT CARRIED OVER NOT ONLY THE INTERIM  
AGREEMENT INEQUALITIES OF ICBM AND SLBM NUMBERS, ICBM THROW-  
WEIGHT INEQUALITIES, AS WELL AS MIRVING OF SOVIET MISSILES,  
AND IN ADDITION WITHDRAWAL OF WHAT THE SOVIETS CALL U.S.  
FBS SYSTEMS. THEY WERE ALSO ASKING FOR BANNING THE ONGOING  
U.S. PROJECTS FOR TRIDENT AND FOLLOW-ON HEAVY BOMBER, WITHOUT  
SAYING ANYTHING ABOUT THE ONGOING MAJOR SOVIET ICBM  
MISSILE AND MIRV PROGRAMS. THE SOVIET PROPOSALS TOOK  
NO ACCOUNT WHATEVER OF THE PROPOSALS THAT WE HAD MADE  
IN MAY, AND THUS IT WAS UNDERSTANDABLE THAT WE VIEWED THEM  
AS NEGATIVE AND UNILATERAL. I SAID AS FAR AS THE U.S.  
POSITION WAS CONCERNED, IT REMAINED AS WE HAD SET FORTH  
IN MAY.

4. IN RESPONSE TO HIS REPLY THAT "WE CANNOT STAND STILL  
BUT MUST MOVE ON," AND THAT WE SHOULD GET AHEAD ON  
NEGOTIATIONS, I POINTED OUT THAT IT HAD TAKEN THEM FIVE  
MONTHS TO REPLY TO OUR MAY PROPOSALS AND THAT, CONSIDERING  
THE ONE-SIDED NATURE OF THE SOVIET PROPOSAL AND ITS FAILURE  
TO TAKE ANY ACCOUNT OF OUR MAY PROPOSALS, WE WERE PUZZLED  
AS TO HOW WE COULD PROCEED AND THAT IT IS UNDERSTANDABLE  
THAT THE U.S. SIDE NEEDS A LITTLE TIME TO DECIDE WHERE WE  
CAN GO IN THE FUTURE. SEMENOV REPLIED BY STATING THAT HE  
WOULD TRY IN HIS FUTURE STATEMENTS TO DEAL WITH SOME OF  
THE CONCERNS THAT I HAD EXPRESSED. JOHNSON

SECRET

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** Z  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 26 OCT 1973  
**Decaption Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Decaption Note:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** golinofr  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1973SALTT05685  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** RR  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** SALT TALKS  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1973/newtext/t1973107/aaaaafbx.tel  
**Line Count:** 97  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** ACTION SS  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 2  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** golinofr  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 31 JAN 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <31-Jan-2002 by martinjw>; APPROVED <20 FEB 2002 by golinofr>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** COMMENTS ON OCTOBER 26 MEETING (SALT TWO-324)  
**TAGS:** PARM  
**To:** SECSTATE WASHDC DOD  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005